

## REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 3, 7, 14, 16, and 20 will be amended, and claims 2, 11, 19, 21-26 will be canceled. As a result, claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, and 20 will remain pending in the application. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Previously pending claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2005/0193103 ("Drabik") in view of US Publication No. 2005/0066086 ("Ramanathan").

Drabik discloses a system for the automatic configuration and management of virtual private networks.

Ramanathan discloses that a universal plug and play capable device can communicate across various types of networks, including virtual private networks.

Applicants respectfully submit that these references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1. In particular, claim 1 as amended recites that virtual private network settings are determined for a node and at least one remote device. Claim 1 further recites "formatting the virtual private network settings in a universal plug and play message format" and "providing the universal plug and play message, including information about the virtual private network settings, to the node over a network." Neither Drabik nor Ramanathan disclose formatting information or providing a universal plug and play message using VPN settings as is now recited in claim 1.

Moreover, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

Applicant believes that the motivation provided in the Office Action ("providing a seamless proximity networking in term[s] of control and data transfer among networked devices" at top of page 11) would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the references to

produce the invention as recited in claim 1. For example, nothing in Drabik nor Ramanathan suggests that the system of Drabik might be modified to include VPN settings in a universal plug and play message. The absence of a convincing motivation in the prior art references to modify the references in the ways recited in the claims indicates that the Examiner has simply recognized a benefit provided by the present invention, and then used that benefit as a motivation to combine the references – the essence of impermissible hindsight reconstruction.

As a result, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested. The remaining claims depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, claim 3 now further recites that a gateway devices receives a VPN request via universal plug and play and determines whether or not a VPN is available for that requesting node. Neither reference discloses or suggests such a universal plug and play VPN request and this is an additional reason why claim 3 should be allowable.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0191.

Respectfully submitted,

August 28, 2007  
Date

/Patrick J. Buckley/  
Patrick J. Buckley  
Registration No. 40,928  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
50 Locust Avenue  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-0191